arXiv:math/0112056v1 [math.PR] 6 Dec 2001

DISCRETE SPACINGS

Chris A.J. Klaassen and J. Theo Runnenburg
Korteweg - de Vries Institute for Mathematics
University of Amsterdam
The Netherlands

November 20, 2001

Summary

Consider a string of n positions, i.e. a discrete string of length n. Units of length k are placed at random on this string in such a way that they do not overlap, and as often as possible, i.e. until all spacings between neighboring units have length less than k. When centered and scaled by $n^{-1/2}$ the resulting numbers of spacings of length $1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ have simultaneously a limiting normal distribution as $n \to \infty$. This is proved by the classical method of moments.

AMS 1991 subject classifications. Primary 60F05 ; secondary 60D05
Key words and phrases. Vacancies on a line, occupancy problem, method of moments.

1. Introduction and main result

Imagine a row of n hooks on which one hangs hats at random. Each hat needs k adjacent hooks. Successive hats are put on the hooks by a random device that selects the next set of k adjacent hooks to be covered by a hat with equal probabilities from the remaining sets of k adjacent hooks. This process continues until all sequences of adjacent free hooks have size less than k.

Let $X_{n,j}$ be the resulting number of sequences of adjacent free hooks of exactly size j. Necessarily j ranges from 1 to $k-1$. In the formulation of the problem given in the Summary, $X_{n,j}$ is the number of spacings of length j. In this paper asymptotic normality of $X_n = \big(X_{n,1}, \ldots, X_{n,k-1}\big)^T$ is proved.

Theorem 1.1 *Let X_n be the vector of numbers of spacings of length j, $j = 1, \ldots, k-1$. Then*

$$Z_n = n^{-1/2}\big(X_n - EX_n\big) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \qquad \text{, as } n \to \infty, \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$n^{-1/2}\big(EX_n - n\theta\big) \longrightarrow 0 \qquad \text{, as } n \to \infty, \tag{1.2}$$

hold. The components θ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, k-1$, of θ are described in Lemma 3.1 *and $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ denotes the centered normal distribution with covariance matrix $\Sigma = \big(\sigma_{ij}\big)_{i,j=1}^{k-1}$ and with σ_{ij} as defined in* (3.13) *through* (3.15).

An outline of our proof of this limit theorem is given in Section 2. The limit behavior of expectation vector and covariance matrix of X_n is studied in Section 3. The case $k = 2$ has been treated along different lines by Runnenburg (1982), who also gives references to literature about this problem. As Runnenburg (1982) mentions, the random device we study here is relevant to problems in chemistry. Mackenzie (1962) describes its application to complete adsorption of linear molecules into parallel troughs (valleys) on suitable crystal surfaces. Here each trough is represented by our row of hooks and our hats symbolize the linear molecules. Mackenzie (1962) has derived the asymptotic behavior of the mean EX_n by a similar technique as in our Lemma 3.1. The strength of our approach is in Lemma 2.1, which enables us to derive the asymptotic normality from the convergence of the first two moments. Our results are compared to these results from literature in Section 4.

A continuous version of this problem has been suggested by Rényi (1958). It is called the parking problem and it has been studied by Dvoretzky and Robbins (1964). Coffman, Flatto, and Jelenković (2000) study the number of vacant intervals in this parking problem when the cars arrive according to a Poisson process in time and place. They consider the asymptotic behavior of mean and variance of this number of intervals at fixed time as the available space (the length of the row of hooks in the discretized version) grows beyond bounds.

2. Heuristics and a key lemma

Clearly, when placing the first hat there are $n-k+1$ possibilities, which all have the same probability $1/(n-k+1)$. If the first hat occupies positions $j+1$ through $j+k$ then two rows of hooks are left, one of size j and the other one of size $n-k-j$. Let J be a random variable uniformly distributed on $\{0,1,\ldots,n-k\}$ and let the $(k-1)$-vector $\tilde{X}_i$ have the same distribution as X_i. We assume that J, $X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_n, \tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \ldots, \tilde{X}_n$ are independent. The above reflection shows (cf. Lemma 2.4 of Runnenburg (1982))

$$\mathcal{L}(X_n) = \mathcal{L}\big(X_J + \tilde{X}_{n-k-J}\big), \qquad n = k,\ k+1, \ldots. \tag{2.1}$$

In terms of characteristic functions this can be formulated simpler:

$$\begin{aligned} Ee^{is^T X_n} &= \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} \Big(Ee^{is^T X_j} \Big) \Big(Ee^{is^T X_{n-k-j}} \Big), \\ & s \in \mathbf{R}^{k-1}, \quad n = k, k+1, \ldots . \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

With $s = n^{-1/2} t$ and Z_n as in the theorem this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Ee^{it^T Z_n} &= \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} \big(Ee^{it^T (j/n)^{1/2} Z_j} \big) \\ & \big(Ee^{it^T ((n-k-j)/n)^{1/2} Z_{n-k-j}} \big) e^{in^{-1/2} t^T (EX_j + EX_{n-k-j} - EX_n)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Here Z_0 is degenerate at 0.

If we could prove that for some finite constant B

$$\|EX_j + EX_{n-k-j} - EX_n\| \le B, \quad j = 0, \ldots, n-k, \quad n = k, k+1, \ldots, \tag{2.4}$$

holds with $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean norm and that $\{Z_n\}$ has a limit distribution with characteristic function ψ then we could deduce from (2.3)

$$\psi(t) = \int_0^1 \psi(\sqrt{u}\, t) \psi(\sqrt{1-u}\, t) du, \quad t \in \mathbf{R}^{k-1}. \tag{2.5}$$

By Lemma A.1 from the Appendix this integral equation implies that $\{Z_n\}$ is asymptotically normal, but the asymptotic covariance structure is not determined in this way, not even if we would know the limit behavior of the covariance matrix of Z_n. Therefore, we will not try to elaborate the details of this approach, but we will use the classical method of moments instead, which does yield the asymptotic covariance matrix.

This method of moments is based on the theorem of Fréchet and Shohat (1931) about the celebrated moment convergence problem, which states that if all moments of $\{Z_n\}$ converge to the corresponding moments of Z and if the moments of Z determine its distribution uniquely, then $\{Z_n\}$ converges to Z in distribution; see 11.4.C, p.187, of Loève (1977) or Takács (1991). Our key-stone for the method of moments is the fact that the normal distribution is indeed determined uniquely by its moments. By considering $\{c^T Z_n\}$ and $c^T Z$ for all c we see that the multidimensional result is obtained from the one-dimensional result.

In Section 3 we shall show the validity of (2.4). Let $\tilde{Z}_n = n^{-1/2}(\tilde{X}_n - E\tilde{X}_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_0 = 0$ a.s. Note that it follows from (2.3) and (2.4) that for all $c \in \mathbf{R}^{k-1}$ and all $m \in \mathbf{N}$, once we have $\sup_j E|c^T Z_j|^{m-1} < \infty$, then we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E\big(c^T Z_n\big)^m \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} E\Bigg(\sqrt{\frac{j}{n}}\ c^T Z_j + \sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n}}\ c^T \tilde{Z}_{n-k-j} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\ c^T\big(EX_j + EX_{n-k-j} - EX_n\big)\Bigg)^m \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} E\Bigg\{\sum_{i=0}^{m} \binom{m}{i} \Bigg(\sqrt{\frac{j}{n}}\ c^T Z_j\Bigg)^i \\
&\qquad\qquad \Bigg(\sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n}}\ c^T \tilde{Z}_{n-k-j}\Bigg)^{m-i}\Bigg\} + \mathcal{O}\Big(n^{-1/2}\Big) \qquad (2.6)\\
&\quad = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \binom{m}{i} \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} \Big(\frac{j}{n}\Big)^{i/2} \Big(\frac{n-k-j}{n}\Big)^{(m-i)/2} E\Big(c^T Z_j\Big)^i \\
&\qquad \cdot E\Big(c^T Z_{n-k-j}\Big)^{m-i} + \frac{2}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} \Big(\frac{j}{n}\Big)^{m/2} E\Big(c^T Z_j\Big)^m \\
&\qquad + \mathcal{O}\Big(n^{-1/2}\Big), \text{ as } n \to \infty,
\end{aligned}
$$

and similarly

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E|c^T Z_n|^m \\
&\quad \le \frac{1}{n-k+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n-k} E\Bigg(\sqrt{\frac{j}{n}}|c^T Z_j| + \sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n}}|c^T \tilde{Z}_{n-k-j}| \\
&\qquad\qquad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\,\big|c^T\big(EX_j + EX_{n-k-j} - EX_n\big)\big|\Bigg)^m \\
&\quad = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1}\binom{m}{i}\frac{1}{n-k+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n-k}\left(\frac{j}{n}\right)^{i/2}\left(\frac{n-k-j}{n}\right)^{(m-i)/2} E|c^T Z_j|^i \\
&\quad \cdot E\big|c^T Z_{n-k-j}\big|^{m-i} + \frac{2}{n-k+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n-k}\left(\frac{j}{n}\right)^{m/2} E\big|c^T Z_j\big|^m \\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}\big(n^{-1/2}\big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.7}
$$

These relations between the (absolute) moments of $c^T Z_n$ enable us to derive the asymptotic behavior of all moments of order $m > 2$ from that of the moments of orders 1 and 2, by the following key result.

Lemma 2.1 *Let* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence of reals. If for some* $k \in \mathbf{N}$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, *and* $\beta > 1$

$$a_n = \alpha + \frac{2}{n-k+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n-k}\left(\frac{j}{n}\right)^{\beta} a_j + o(1), \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{2.8}$$

holds, then $\{a_n\}$ *converges and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = \alpha\,\frac{\beta+1}{\beta-1} \tag{2.9}$$

holds. Moreover, if the elements a_n *of a possibly other sequence* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *are nonnegative and bounded from above by the right-hand side of* (2.8) *for some* $k \in \mathbf{N}$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, *and* $\beta > 1$, *then* $\sup_n a_n$ *is finite.*

Proof. If $\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty}|a_n| = \infty$, then there exists a sequence $\{n_i\}$, $n_i \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$, such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|a_{n_i}| = \sup\{|a_h| : h \le n_i\}, \\
&|a_{n_i}| \to \infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

By (2.8) this yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 = \left|\frac{a_{n_i}}{a_{n_i}}\right| &\le \left|\frac{2}{n_i-k+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_i-k}\left(\frac{j}{n_i}\right)^{\beta}\frac{a_j}{|a_{n_i}|}\right| + o(1) \\
&\le \frac{2}{n_i-k+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n_i-k}\left(\frac{j}{n_i}\right)^{\beta} + o(1) = 2\int_0^1 x^{\beta}dx + o(1) \\
&= \frac{2}{\beta+1} + o(1),
\end{aligned}
$$

which is a contradiction in view of $\beta > 1$. Consequently, we have

$$\overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} |a_n| < \infty, \text{ and } \sup_n |a_n| = a < \infty. \tag{2.10}$$

Incidentally, this proves the second statement of the Lemma. Let m_n be a sequence of integers tending slowly to infinity; more precisely, $m_n \to \infty$ and $m_n/n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. By (2.8) and (2.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} a_n \leq & \alpha + \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \left\{ \frac{2}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=m_n}^{n-k} \left(\frac{j}{n}\right)^{\beta} \sup_{h\geq m_n} a_h + 2a \frac{m_n}{n-k+1} \right\} \\ = & \alpha + \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \left\{ 2 \int_0^1 x^{\beta} dx \sup_{h\geq m_n} a_h \right\} \\ = & \alpha + \frac{2}{\beta+1} \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} a_n. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} a_n \leq \alpha \frac{\beta+1}{\beta-1}. \tag{2.12}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} a_n \geq \alpha + & \underline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \left\{ \frac{2}{\beta+1} \inf_{h\geq m_n} a_h - 2a \frac{m_n}{n-k+1} \right\} \\ = \alpha + & \frac{2}{\beta+1} \underline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} a_n, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\underline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} a_n \geq \alpha \frac{\beta+1}{\beta-1}. \tag{2.13}$$

QED

From (2.6) and Lemma 2.1 with $\beta = m/2 > 1$ it follows that all moments converge once the first two (absolute) moments do and more explicitly that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} E\left(c^T Z_n\right)^m = & \frac{m+2}{m-2} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \binom{m}{i} \int_0^1 x^{i/2} (1-x)^{(m-i)/2} dx \\ & \cdot \lim_{n\to\infty} E\left(c^T Z_n\right)^i \lim_{n\to\infty} E\left(c^T Z_n\right)^{m-i} \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

holds. Note that existence (and boundedness in n) of the odd moments is verified here by application of the second part of Lemma 2.1 to the corresponding absolute moments satisfying (2.7). Of course, the first moment vanishes. Assume

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E(c^T Z_n)^2 = \sigma^2 < \infty \tag{2.15}$$

and note that this implies the existence and boundedness in n of the first absolute moments. Denote $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} E\big(c^T Z_n\big)^m$ by μ_m for $m > 2$. From (2.14) and by induction on m we arrive at

$$\mu_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{odd} \\ & \text{if } m \text{ is} \\ 2^{-m/2} m! \sigma^m/(m/2)! & \text{even,} \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

which are the moments of a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2. This yields asymptotic normality of $c^T Z_n$ by the method of moments as discussed in Section 1, since the normal distribution is determined by its moments; see e.g. Feller (1971), Examples VIII.6(b) and VIII.1(e), pages 269 and 251, 252. Consequently, the proof of (1.1) is complete once we have proved (2.4) and (2.15) with $\sigma^2 = c^T \Sigma c$. This will be done in the next section.

3. Asymptotics for the first two moments

Asymptotically EX_n behaves as follows.

Lemma 3.1 *With the notation*

$$e_k(y) = \exp\big\{2[y + y^2/2 + \ldots + y^{k-1}/(k-1)]\big\}$$

and

$$\theta_j = 2\big(e_k(1)\big)^{-1} \int_0^1 (1-y) y^j e_k(y)\,dy, \quad j = 1, \ldots, k-1,$$

there exists for every $R > 1$ *a constant* B_R *with*

$$|EX_{n,j} - (n+k)\theta_j| \le B_R\, R^{-n}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, k-1, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots . \tag{3.1}$$

Note that (3.1) implies (2.4) and (1.2), and enables us to conclude from (1.1) that also

$$n^{-1/2}\Big(X_n - n\theta\Big) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \tag{3.2}$$

holds. Therefore, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete once (1.1) has been shown.

Proof of Lemma 3.1 Fix $c \in \mathbf{R}^{k-1}$ and let $\gamma_n = Ec^T X_n$. By (2.1) or (2.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_n &= \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} (\gamma_j + \gamma_{n-k-j}) \\ &= \frac{2}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} \gamma_j, \quad n = k, k+1, \ldots, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and hence

$$(n-k+1)\gamma_n = (n-k)\gamma_{n-1} + 2\gamma_{n-k}, \quad n = k+1, k+2, \ldots, \tag{3.4}$$

hold. Using generating functions similar to Overdijk (1981) (see also Mackenzie (1962)) we define

$$G(z) = \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \gamma_n z^{n-k+1} \tag{3.5}$$

for $|z| < 1$ (note $\gamma_n = \mathcal{O}(n)$). Multiplying (3.4) by z^{n-k} and summing over $n = k+1, k+2, \ldots$ we obtain

$$(1-z)G'(z) = 2z^{k-1}G(z) + 2[\gamma_1 z + \ldots + \gamma_k z^k] + \gamma_k z.$$

In fact, $\gamma_k = 0$ since $X_k = 0$ a.s., and $\gamma_i = c_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$. Solving this differential equation under the side condition $G(0) = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G(z) &= (1-z)^{-2}\psi(z), \\ \psi(z) &= 2\big(e_k(z)\big)^{-1} \int_0^z \big[c_1 y + \ldots + c_{k-1} y^{k-1}\big](1-y)e_k(y)dy. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Note that $\psi(z)$, $z \in \mathbf{C}$, is an entire function and write $\psi(z) = \Sigma_{i=2}^{\infty} a_i z^i$. Then (3.6) yields

$$G(z) = \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=2}^{n-k+1} (n-k+2-i) a_i z^{n-k+1} \tag{3.7}$$

and hence by comparison to (3.5), for $n = k+1, k+2, \ldots,$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_n &= \sum_{i=2}^{n-k+1} (n-k+2-i) a_i \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} (n-k+2-i) a_i - \sum_{i=n-k+3}^{\infty} (n-k+2-i) a_i \\ &= (n-k+2)\psi(1) - \psi'(1) + R_n \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

with

$$|R_n| = \Big|\sum_{i=n-k+3}^{\infty}\big(i-(n-k+2)\big)a_i\Big| \le \sum_{i=n-k+3}^{\infty} i|a_i|. \tag{3.9}$$

Since $\psi(z),\ z \in \mathbf{C}$, is an entire function, $z\psi'(z) = \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} ia_iz^i$ is entire as well and by Cauchy's root test for the radius of convergence of analytic functions we obtain

$$\overline{\lim_{i\to\infty}}|ia_i|^{1/i} = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Consequently, for arbitrary $R > 1$ and n sufficiently large we have

$$\sum_{i=n}^{\infty} i|a_i| \le \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} R^{-i} = \frac{R^{-n}}{1-R^{-1}}. \tag{3.11}$$

Finally, note

$$(n-k+2)\psi(1) - \psi'(1) = (n+k)\psi(1) = (n+k)c^T\theta, \tag{3.12}$$

which by (3.8),(3.9), and (3.11) implies the lemma. QED

For our study of the (asymptotic) covariance structure of X_n we need some extra notation. Let

$$G_i(z) = 2(1-z)^{-2}\big(e_k(z)\big)^{-1}\int_0^z y^i(1-y)e_k(y)dy \tag{3.13}$$

be the generating function as in (3.5) through (3.6) of the means of $X_{n,i}$, $i = 1,\dots,k-1, n = k+1, k+2, \dots,$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ij}(z) =& (1-z)z^i\mathbf{1}_{[i=j]} + (1-z)^2(z^i + z^{k-1}G_i(z))(z^j + z^{k-1}G_j(z)) \\ &- \theta_i\theta_j(1-z)^{-2}\Big(3 + (4k-5)(1-z) + 2(k-1)^2(1-z)^2 \\ &- 2k^2(1-z)^4 - \big(2 + (4k-3)(1-z) + (2k-1)^2(1-z)^2 \\ &- 4k^2(1-z)^3\big)z^k\Big), \qquad i,j = 1,\dots,k-1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

We will show that

$$\sigma_{ij} = 2\big(e_k(1)\big)^{-1}\int_0^1 H_{ij}(y)e_k(y)dy \tag{3.15}$$

is well defined and even that

Lemma 3.2 *For* $i, j = 1, \ldots, k-1,$ *and for every* $R > 1,$

$$\operatorname{Cov}(X_{n,i}, X_{n,j}) = (n+k)\sigma_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(R^{-n}), \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{3.16}$$

holds and consequently Σ *of Theorem 1.1 satisfies*

$$\Sigma = \big(\sigma_{ij}\big)_{i,j=1}^{k-1}. \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. Fix $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ and let $c_n = EX_{n,i}X_{n,j} - (n+k)^2\theta_i\theta_j$ for $n = 0, 1, \ldots$. By (2.1) or (2.2) we obtain

$$c_n = \frac{2}{n-k+1}\sum_{h=0}^{n-k}\{c_h + (h+k)^2\theta_i\theta_j + EX_{h,i}EX_{n-k-h,j}\} - (n+k)^2\theta_i\theta_j \tag{3.18}$$

and hence

$$(n-k+1)c_n = (n-k)c_{n-1} + 2c_{n-k} + 2\delta_{n,i,j}, \qquad n = k+1,\, k+2, \ldots, \tag{3.19}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{n,i,j} = &\sum_{h=0}^{n-k-1}\{\epsilon_{h,i}\theta_j + \theta_i\epsilon_{h,j} + \epsilon_{h,i}(\epsilon_{n-k-h,j} - \epsilon_{n-k-h-1,j})\}\\ &+ k\theta_i\epsilon_{n-k,j},\end{aligned}$$

$$\epsilon_{h,i} = EX_{h,i} - (h+k)\theta_i, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k-1, h = 0, 1, \ldots.$$

Tedious computation shows

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty}\delta_{n,i,j}z^{n-k} =&\sum_{h=0}^{\infty}\sum_{n=k+h+1}^{\infty}\{\epsilon_{h,i}z^h\theta_j z^{n-k-h} + \theta_i\epsilon_{h,j}z^h z^{n-k-h}\\ &+ \epsilon_{h,i}z^h\epsilon_{n-k-h,j}z^{n-k-h} - \epsilon_{h,i}z^h\epsilon_{n-k-h-1,j}z^{n-k-h-1}z\}\\ &+ k\theta_i\sum_{h=1}^{\infty}\epsilon_{h,j}z^h\\ =&(1-z)(z^i + z^{k-1}G_i(z))(z^j + z^{k-1}G_j(z))\\ &+ \theta_i\theta_j\{k^2 - (1-z)^{-3}(1 + (k-1)(1-z))^2\}.\end{aligned}$$

By an argument similar to that to derive (3.6) through (3.8) from (3.4) we obtain from (3.19)

$$G_{ij}(z) = \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty}c_n z^{n-k+1} = (1-z)^{-2}\psi_{ij}(z) \tag{3.20}$$

with

$$\psi_{ij}(z) = 2\big(e_k(z)\big)^{-1} \int\limits_0^z H_{ij}(y) e_k(y) dy = \sum_{h=3}^{\infty} b_h z^h, \tag{3.21}$$

and consequently, as in (3.6) through (3.9) and (3.12),

$$\begin{aligned} c_n &= (n-k+2)\psi_{ij}(1) - \psi'_{ij}(1) + R_n \\ &= (n+k)\sigma_{ij} + R_n \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

with $\psi_{ij}(1) = \sigma_{ij}$ given in (3.15) and with

$$|R_n| \le \sum_{h=n-k+3}^{\infty} h|b_h|. \tag{3.23}$$

To complete the argument along the lines of the end of the proof of Lemma 3.1, i.e. along the lines of (3.10) we have to show that $\psi_{ij}(z),\ z \in \mathbf{C}$, is entire. Indeed, it may be verified that, as $z \to 1$, the function $G_i(z),\ z \in \mathbf{C}$, behaves like $\theta_i(1-z)^{-2}(1+2(k-1)(1-z)) + \mathcal{O}(1)$ and hence $H_{ij}(z)$ like $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Consequently, $H_{ij}(z),\ z \in \mathbf{C}$, is entire, since $(1-z)^2 G_i(z)$ is. Together with Lemma 3.1 this implies that (3.22) yields (3.16). QED

Note that by the argument of Section 2, (3.16) implies that all moments of $c^T Z_n$ with Z_n as in (1.1) converge to those of a normal distribution. Consequently, Theorem 1.1 holds with Σ as in (3.17).

4. Comparison to literature

For $k = 2$ and $i = j = 1$, Lemma 3.1 holds with

$$\theta_1 = 2e^{-2} \int_0^1 (1-y) y e^{2y} dy = e^{-2}. \tag{4.1}$$

Furthermore, lengthy computations show

$$G_1(z) = (1-z)^{-2} e^{2z} - 1, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{11}(z) =& z(1-z) + (1 - 2(1-z)^{-1} + (1-z)^{-2}) e^{-4z} \\ & - e^{-4}\big((1-z)^{-2} + 2(1-z)^{-1} + 1 + 29(1-z) \\ & - 49(1-z)^2 + 16(1-z)^3\big), \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

and finally

$$\sigma_{11} = 2e^{-2} \int_0^1 H_{11}(y) e^{2y} dy = 4e^{-4}. \tag{4.4}$$

These results agree with the expressions for the asymptotic mean and variance obtained in (3.20) and (3.27) respectively, of Runnenburg (1982). Mackenzie (1962) has studied asymptotic mean and variance of the total vacant length

$$V_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} j X_{n,j}. \tag{4.5}$$

Our Theorem 1.1 yields asymptotic normality of the standardized V_n. Moreover, Lemma 3.1 and

(4.6)

$$\begin{aligned} e_k(1)\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} j\theta_j &= 2\int_0^1 (1-y)(y+2y^2+\ldots+(k-1)y^{k-1})e_k(y)dy \\ &= 2\int_0^1 \big((ky-(k-1)y^2)(1+y+\ldots+y^{k-2})-(k-1)y\big)e_k(y)dy \\ &= [(ky-(k-1)y^2)e_k(y)]_0^1 - k\int_0^1 e_k(y)dy \\ &= e_k(1) - k\int_0^1 e_k(y)dy \end{aligned}$$

yield the existence for every $R > 1$ of a constant B_R with

$$|EV_n - (n+k)\big(1-k(e_k(1))^{-1}\int_0^1 e_k(y)dy| \le B_R\, R^{-n}, n = 1, 2, \ldots . \tag{4.7}$$

This result is in line with (A28) and (A25) of Mackenzie (1962). An asymptotic expression with an exponentially small error as above can be obtained also for the variance of V_n via Lemma 3.2.

Appendix

Lemma A.1 *Any random variable on* $\mathbf{R}^d$ *with characteristic function* ψ *satisfying integral equation* (2.5), *i.e.*

$$\psi(t) = \int_0^1 \psi(\sqrt{u}\,t)\psi(\sqrt{1-u}\,t)du, \quad t \in \mathbf{R}^{k-1},$$

has a normal distribution.

Proof. Fix $a \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and define

$$\chi_a(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sw}\psi(\sqrt{w}\,a)dw\,, s > 0. \tag{A.1}$$

By the boundedness of ψ this Laplace transform is well defined and by dominated convergence we obtain

$$\chi_a^{'}(s) = \frac{d}{ds}\chi_a(s) = -\int_0^\infty e^{-sw} w\psi(\sqrt{w}\,a)dw\,. \tag{A.2}$$

Consequently, (2.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} -\chi_a^{'}(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-sw} w \int_0^1 \psi(\sqrt{uw}\,a)\psi(\sqrt{(1-u)w}\,a)du\,dw \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^w e^{-sw}\psi(\sqrt{v}\,a)\psi(\sqrt{w-v}\,a)dv\,dw \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_v^\infty e^{-s(w-v)}\psi(\sqrt{w-v}\,a)\,dw e^{-sv}\psi(\sqrt{v}\,a)\,dv \\ &= \chi_a^2(s) \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

and hence there exists $b_a \in \mathbf{C}$ with

$$\chi_a(s) = \frac{1}{b_a + s}\,, s > 0.$$

By Laplace inversion (cf. e.g. VII.6.6, p.233, of Feller (1971)) this implies

$$\psi(\sqrt{w}\,a) = e^{-b_a w}\,, w > 0.$$

Consequently, a random d-vector Z with characteristic function ψ satisfies

$$Ee^{isa^T Z} = \psi(sa) = e^{-b_a s^2}\,, s > 0,$$

and hence $a^T Z$ is normal for any $a \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and Z is multivariate normal indeed. QED

Acknowledgements We would like to thank Jaap Korevaar and Jan Wiegerinck for suggesting the use of Laplace transforms in analyzing equation (2.5) and Jordan Stoyanov for the reference to Takács (1991).

References

Coffman, E.G. Jr., L. Flatto, and P. Jelenković (2000). Interval packing: the vacant interval distribution. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **10**, 240–257.

Dvoretzky, A. and H. Robbins (1964). On the ‘parking’ problem. *MTA Mat. Kut. Int. Kžl.* **9**, 209–225.

Feller, W.(1971). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, Vol.II, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York.

Fréchet, M. and J. Shohat (1931). A proof of the generalized second-limit theorem in the theory of probability. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **33**, 533–543.

Loève, M. (1977). *Probability Theory*, Vol.I, 4th ed., Springer, New York.

Overdijk, D. (1981). Solution of Problem 102(101) of Runnenburg and Steutel (in Dutch). *Statist. Neerlandica* **35**, 175–178.

Rényi, A. (1958). On a one-dimensional random space-filling problem. *MTA Mat. Kut. Int. Kžl.* **3**, 109–127.

Runnenburg, J.Th. (1982). Asymptotic normality in vacancies on a line. *Statist. Neerlandica* **36**, 135–148.

Takács, L. (1991). A moment convergence theorem. *Amer. Math. Monthly* **98**, 742–746.